

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/607,006 06/26/2003		Surendra N. Naidoo	4017-3006	4938
30652 75	590 12/16/2004		EXAMINER	
CONLEY ROSE, P.C. 5700 GRANITE PARKWAY, SUITE 330			POPE, DARYL C	
PLANO, TX 75024			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2632	
			DATE MAILED: 12/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/607,006	NAIDOO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	DARYL C POPE	2632					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days a reply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r .						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	•						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	d in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	`					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te atent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	, ,					

DETAILED ACTION

ART REJECTION:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

- 2. Claims 1-7,12-15,23,30, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Faulkner et al(6,798,344).
- -- In considering claims 1,3,5-7, and 39 the claimed subject matter that is met by Faulkner et al(Faulkner) includes:
- 1) the base station is met by the secured locations(203) which generate alarm video corresponding to an alarm event(see: column 3, lines 18 et seq);

2) the central station is met by the central monitoring station(201) coupled through network 209 and receives substantially real time alarm video(see: column 3 lines 56-65).

- -- In considering claim 2,23, and 30 the Internet is met by the Internet link of Faulkner(see: column 4, lines 51-58.
- -- In considering **claim 4**, the claimed one or more sensor units is met by the alarm sensor positioned in the secured location.
- -- In considering claims 12-15, the high speed network connection is met(see: column 3, lines 50-52.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 8-11,16-22,24-29, and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faulkner et al(Faulkner).
- -- In considering **claim 8**, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a 360 degree camera, since this would have ensured the broadest possible coverage of the monitored area.
- -- In considering claims 9-11, the examiner takes Official notice, that in the video monitoring art, use of systems which begin intervals before an alarm event, end the interval after the alarm event, and as well utilize a predetermined interval duration is

well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate any of the above stated intervals into the system of Faulkner, since one of ordinary skill would have recognized the most optimal time interval for the system as desired.

- -- In considering **claims 16,31**, and **34**, since Faulkner already teaches transmitting signals sent from the secured locations(203) to remote stations(211-215), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to bypass the central station, since this would have helped reduce unnecessary signal traffic to the central station.
- -- In considering claims 17 and 32, the central station creation of the secure data connection after authenticating by the remote station is met by a valid password being necessary in order to access signals from the central station(see: column 4, lines 1-15).
- -- In considering **claims 18-22,33**, and **35-38**, upon authorization of the remote stations(211-215) of Faulkner, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the remote station to be operable to control activation, deactivation, and any other function of the base station as desired since this would have facilitated optimal response to the base station upon occurrence of events.
- -- In considering **claims 24**, it would have been obvious that the central station would have detected real time uncoupling from the base station, since the monitoring signal would have been real time, and therefore uncoupling would have been detected by a lost real time signal.

-- In considering claims 25-26, the examiner takes Official Notice that in the alarm

monitoring art, use of audio signals in conjunction with video signals is well known, and

Page 5

therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate audio signals into the system of Faulkner, since this

would have provided another reliable means of verifying alarm events.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to DARYL C POPE whose telephone number is (571) 272-

2959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 8:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, DANIEL WU can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daryl C. Pope

DARYL C POPE

Primary Examiner

Art Unit**∕26**32 ∕

Dec. 12, 2004